

REMARKS

Reconsideration of the present application is respectfully requested.

Claims 1-20 stand rejected under 35 USC §102(e) over Shafer et al. Applicants respectfully disagree since the claims can not be read consistent with Applicants specification, as they must be, and also fairly read onto the subject matter shown in the cited reference. During the recent telephone interview, the Examiner agreed that original claims 1-7 can not be read onto the Shafer reference since it does not teach relieving pressure in two separate needle control chambers in order to inject fuel in two separate spray patterns. Thus, Applicants respectfully request that the outstanding rejections against claims 1-7 be withdrawn.

With regard to the remaining claims, during the interview the Examiner agreed that additional terms in the claim would help prevent them from being misread onto the Shafer et al. reference. In this regard, Applicants have amended independent claims 8 and 15 to make it clear that each of the first and second needle valve members includes opening and closing hydraulic surfaces. In addition, the claims now make it explicitly clear that the respective closing hydraulic surfaces are exposed to fluid pressure in respective first and second needle control chambers. There should be no dispute that the claims can no longer be misread onto the Shafer et al. reference. Therefore, Applicants respectfully request that the amendments be entered and that the outstanding rejections against claims 8-20 be withdrawn.

This application is believed to be in condition for allowance of claims 1-20 however, if the Examiner believes that some minor additional clarification would put this application in even better condition for allowance, the Examiner is invited to contact the undersigned attorney at (812) 333-5355 in order to hasten the prosecution of this application.

Respectfully submitted,



Michael B. McNeil
Reg. No: 35, 949